

AMERICAN BROADCASTING COMPANY



LIBRARY
COLLEGE OF PUGET SOUND
TACOMA, WASH.
8:30 p.m., E.S.T., NOVEMBER 22, 1945

Town Meeting



Bulletin OF AMERICA'S
TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR
Sponsored by THE READER'S DIGEST

We Won the War; Are We Winning the Peace?

Moderator, GEORGE V. DENNY, JR.

Speakers

CHARLES W. TOBEY
NORMAN COUSINS

RICHARD C. HOTTELET
BEN KUROKI

(See also page 12)

COMING DECEMBER 6th

Do We Need Universal Military Training Now?

(PREVIEW IN THIS ISSUE—SEE PAGE 23)

TUNE IN EVERY THURSDAY, AMERICAN BROADCASTING COMPANY—8:30 p.m., E.S.T.

★ ★ ★ C O N T E N T S ★ ★ ★

The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of view presented.

THE BROADCAST OF NOVEMBER 22:

**"We Won the War; Are We Winning
the Peace?"**

<i>Mr. DENNY</i>	3
<i>Sergeant KUROKI</i>	4
<i>Mr. HOTTELET</i>	6
<i>Mr. COUSINS</i>	8
<i>Senator TOBEY</i>	11
THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN	12
QUESTIONS, PLEASE!	13

THE BROADCAST OF NOVEMBER 29:

**"Does the Atomic Bomb Make World
Government Essential Now?"**

THE BROADCAST OF DECEMBER 6:

**"Do We Need Universal Military
Training Now?"**

TOWN MEETING PREVIEW	23
----------------------	----

The Broadcast of November 22, 1945, originated in Town Hall in New York City, from 8:30 to 9:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, over the American Broadcasting Company Network.

Town Meeting is published weekly by *The Reader's Digest*, Town Meeting Publication Office: 32 South Fourth St., Columbus 15, Ohio. Send subscriptions to Town Hall, 123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N.Y. Subscription price, \$4.50 a year 10c a copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1897.



Town Meeting

Bulletin of America's Town Meeting of the Air



George V. Denny, Jr., Moderator

We Won the War; Are We Winning the Peace?

Announcer:

The Reader's Digest, America's favorite magazine, welcomes you to a special Thanksgiving Day session of America's Town Meeting, the program that gives both sides of issues affecting your life and mine. Tonight here at Town Hall, New York, we face a question to which America must find an affirmative answer to avoid a disastrous third world war. To open this important session, *The Reader's Digest* brings you the president of Town Hall, founder and moderator of America's Town Meeting, Mr. George V. Denny, Jr. Mr. Denny. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Good evening, neighbors, and thanks again for your help in selecting our Town Meeting topic. Tonight's question was at the very top of the list on the balloting two weeks ago and I know you'll agree it's a most appropriate Thanksgiving program.

We won the war and for that we are profoundly thankful. We

are thankful to Divine Providence and we are mindful, too, of the debt we owe to the men and women of every land who made the supreme sacrifice, and in some cases worse, that we might remain free.

But the bells of victory were scarcely still before our ancient enemies, fear, greed, suspicion, prejudice—the Four Horsemen of discord—began their work. These enemies are a far greater menace to us than a Hitler, a Mussolini, or a Tojo, for they creep quietly and sinisterly into our bloodstream like a deadly virus and do their evil work before we're aware of their presence.

So let's turn our attention to these subtle enemies who seek to turn our glorious victory into a humiliating defeat. Are we winning the peace?

Let's ask Sergeant Ben Kuroki, Nisei airman, winner of the Distinguished Flying Cross, one of the real heroes of this war, who'll tell us his own dramatic story of

the America he found after 58 missions against the enemy.

Let's ask Richard C. Hottelet, foreign correspondent and radio commentator, who covered this war fully and who spent the last year with our Occupation Forces in Germany.

Let's ask Norman Cousins, the brilliant young editor of *The Saturday Review of Literature*, author of *Modern Man Is Obsolete*, now a best seller.

Finally, let's ask that great New Englander, United States Senator Charles W. Tobey, Republican from the State of New Hampshire.

I'm going to start by asking Sergeant Ben Kuroki something about what's going on in his home town of Hershey, Nebraska, tonight. Ben, how large a town is Hershey, Nebraska?

Sergeant Kuroki: About 450, Mr. Denny.

Moderator Denny: About 450 people. Are they having a Thanksgiving celebration out there tonight, do you think?

Sergeant Kuroki: Oh, I presume most all of them are and probably some of them are still out there herding their cattle in.

Moderator Denny: And you'd be out there yourself if it weren't for this program because I understand you've flown back here especially for this. Is that right?

Sergeant Kuroki: That's right.

Moderator Denny: Well, we're deeply grateful to you, Ben, and we want to hear your story of why you think we are not winning the

peace just now. Sergeant Ben Kuroki of Hershey, Nebraska. (*Applause.*)

Sergeant Kuroki:

I keep hearing people say that GI's don't know what they were fighting for. Maybe the authorities and the "big wheels" have it all figured out. I'm a farm boy from Nebraska and I can't speak for all GI's, but I can speak for myself. I've had 30 combat missions over Europe and 28 in the Pacific and I knew what I was fighting for all right.

Back in High School in Hershey, Nebraska, I learned that America was built on the belief that all men were created equal. That's the way people live back in Hershey and it's a good way to live. I believed in it and I was willing to fight for it. I went to fight against Hitler and Tojo and against the Fascist idea that one nation or one race or one color is better than all the rest.

I remember when I finished my missions and came home from Europe. I was in a railroad station in Denver and I started to share a taxi with a man and he told me, "I'm not going to ride with a lousy Jap. I'm from California."

I was wearing my wings and all my ribbons, but it didn't matter. I was so mad that I felt like crying. I think that's when I realized that I had to fight not only Hitler and Tojo, but a few people in this country who don't believe in the principles of freedom upon which this Nation was founded.

The enemy is Fascism and prejudice and intolerance, whether it's in Germany or in a taxicab in Denver, or a member of the Ku Klux Klan, or even a Congressman from Mississippi. (*Applause.*)

I wasn't the only one who fought for the belief that it isn't race or color that makes us free men. The crew of our plane included a Polish gunner, a Jewish engineer, a German bombardier, and a full-blooded Dakota Indian.

Add to that outfits like the 442nd Infantry Combat team of Japanese-Americans who fought in Italy and France. The 442nd was the most decorated unit in United States military history in relation to time spent in combat. One out of every two men got the Purple Heart. Sixty-five got Distinguished Service Crosses. Two hundred and ninety got the silver star. Seven hundred and eighty-two got the bronze star.

Add to that thousands of specially trained Japanese-American intelligence troops who fought at Guadalcanal, New Georgia, the Philippines, Okinawa, Burma, and China, and the 99th Negro Fighter Squadron which shot down 17 enemy planes in three days over Anzio, and the 333rd Negro Field Artillery, fighting from St. Lo right through to the Rhine.

Millions of Japanese-Americans, Negro-Americans, Jewish-Americans, and Italian-Americans fought in this war. Every GI who fought alongside of them learned that whatever race men belonged to, the blood of the wounded is all the same color and that the last

screams of the dying have no accent.

Some of the men who learned that were the 28 Pacific veterans in Stockton, California, who recently restored a desecrated Japanese-American cemetery. Their leader said, "I don't see how anyone who calls himself an American could pull anything like this. I know how I'd feel if my parents were buried and I came home to find their graves desecrated because they had foreign names."

I used to think that I could finish my missions and just come home and lie out under a tree somewhere and forget the war. But I've learned that war doesn't end on any hour or any day. The last shot is fired and the surrender is signed, but there's no special day when war ends and peace begins.

You can only win peace slowly, day after day in a fight for a decent job for every man and a good house to live in and a chance of living without prejudice in a world where our kids won't have to fight another war in 20 years.

I've had 58 combat missions and I'm pretty tired and my hands still shake a little, but I've got one more mission to go. There is still the fight against prejudice and race hatred. I call it my 59th mission and I have a hunch that's one mission I won't be flying alone. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Ben Kuroki. You're insisting on being a hero right on through to help us win this

peace. We're mighty grateful for what you've said to us tonight. I recognize up there in the balcony—I don't know whether they have anything to say to us tonight, but I know that this audience wants to welcome them on your behalf—five paratroopers who've just come back from Italy. They are Nisei American citizens. We're proud to see them wearing this uniform and the Purple Heart. Let's give them a hand. (*Applause.*)

Now we're going to hear from Richard C. Hottelet. He's a very strange kind of animal. He's a native New Yorker—born right up here on Broadway at 186th Street. Dick, last Thanksgiving Day, where were you?

Mr. Hottelet: I was with the First Division in the Huertgen Forest, George.

Moderator Denny: That's up there around Aachen?

Mr. Hottelet: East of Aachen.

Moderator Denny: East of Aachen. Quite a different thing today.

Mr. Hottelet: Last Thanksgiving men were thankful just to be alive. It's a bit better now.

Moderator Denny: And how do you feel about winning this peace? Are we winning it or not?

Mr. Hottelet: Well, I don't think we are *yet*, but I think the chances are not too bad.

Moderator Denny: Well, let's hear the opinion of Richard C. Hottelet, foreign correspondent, radio commentator and a newspaper journalist extraordinary. Mr. Hottelet. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Hottelet:

I never thought when I came home I would find America so smug about international affairs. People assure me isolationism is dead, and tell me that America follows closely what goes on abroad.

The country has the facts all right, but the trouble is it seems to think that's enough. Most of the people I've met have been content to take these facts one by one, proud to display them in conversation one by one. But very few seem to put them together to form a bigger picture. Practically none, from what I gather, have worked out in their own minds what to do about it. That is why I feel we're not winning the peace in Europe.

Knowing a lot of facts is like having a pile of bricks. If you want to build a house, you have to know first what kind of a house you want and then you've got to act. You've got to build it.

I find that many people here are still worrying about an international villain. Some think it is Russia. A great many still think that Germany is going to rise up again as a source of trouble and they lose sight of everything but jumping up and down on Germany's neck.

I don't think for a minute that Russia is out to sabotage the peace and to those who worry about Germany starting another war, the answer is Germany is so completely at our mercy that if anything does go wrong it can only be our fault.

We're going to have to get our own thinking straight. Then it's going to take courage to lay down a line and follow it.

Look at Germany. I've just come back from there and I happen to know a little bit about it. That country, or what's left of it, is a small stage on which we're rehearsing the postwar world. It's the only place where the vital interest of four of the Big Five comes so close together geographically.

If there's going to be stability in Europe, we've got to start by producing stability in Germany.

But today the carcass of Germany is chopped into four different parts with four different masters, and none of the four seems to know exactly what it wants. They certainly haven't told one another.

What kind of a Germany does America want to see developed along about 1960 or 1970? I've seen no clear line in our zone of occupation that has given me a clue. I've heard no clear opinion on the subject since I got back home.

What we are doing in Germany today is poking along on a strictly day to day basis. Our military government officers try to avoid epidemics and distribute the food they've got. They try to restore public services, do all the things you would do in a backward colony.

The only thing you can call real policy is the destruction of Nazism, but it's a purely negative policy. We can't go on forever just con-

centrating on destroying a state of mind without putting anything in its place. A dentist who drills out a decayed tooth has to put in a filling if he wants to save it.

But we're not alone in lacking a policy. It's pretty much the same with the others, although it shows up in different ways. The Russians are more politically minded. They encourage political parties which includes party newspapers and mass meetings. They encourage labor unions.

I have found, for instance on the other hand, the British are more inclined to preserve German industrial capacity than any of the others.

The French come all the way out in demanding that Germany be crippled forever.

But none of the big powers is in a position clearly and sharply to define what it wants, much less to influence any of the others towards a clear policy. So they're content to carry on parallel programs, to work side by side instead of together.

All over Europe I saw that the smaller nations are taking Germany as an example of the "Big Powers" ability to work together. It seems to me that America has become a great European power. Most Europeans accept it and they feel as willing to follow an intelligent American lead as any other.

But Europe's great fear right now, and one that will surely bring trouble, is that America will again pull out. I've heard it said too often, "The American people are too far away. They don't know

what's at stake." And I will say that America in the last few months has taken no positive action in Europe to reassure them.

This new postwar period calls for honesty. America must get a clear picture in her mind of what kind of a Europe she wants to see develop and, having done that, America must have the courage to take action.

An immediate action would be to propose a clearer program of European unity. Our word has great weight, perhaps more than we know, and we have great power. I don't mean the atomic bomb, I mean the power that grows out of the entire world, realizing that a new world can't be built without America.

No nation on earth wants deliberately to walk down the road to war. Such a positive policy must rest on the will of the American people. America can lead; it did so in war. It must lead in peace. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Dick Hottelet, for underscoring that criticism that's been made of us before, that we don't know our own strength. Our next speaker was introduced the other night. He's the author of a book that is now a best seller. I hasten to say the correct title of the book is *Modern Man Is Obsolete*. It's the longer version of a well-known editorial that was reprinted in newspapers and magazines throughout the country, an editorial by Norman Cousins. Somebody introduced the book the other

night in Washington as *Modern Marriage Is Obsolete*. (*Laughter.*) I'm very glad indeed to welcome you to Town Hall. Mr. Cousins is the moderator himself of the Norwalk, Connecticut, Town Meeting, and he's the distinguished young editor of a very successful publication, *The Saturday Review of Literature*. Norman Cousins. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Cousins:

We have won the war, but there is a very real danger that we may be losing the peace. It is even worse than that. America today may be heading into the most serious peril in its history. But we are not alive to that peril. Just because the war is over, we sit back expecting the benefits of peace to drop like overripe fruit from trees. We live in a fairyland of dreams, indulging ourselves in the luxury of domestic squabbles.

We don't realize that we have been plunged into an atomic age—that, literally, a thousand years of human evolution were compressed into that brief fraction of a second during that explosion, that hideously successful explosion of an atomic bomb over Hiroshima.

We don't realize that everything has been profoundly changed by this new development, probably the most towering development in human history since the invention of fire.

We don't realize that unless we can catch up with destructive science, unless we can make a thousand-year jump in our thinking, in our way of life, in our

institutions, we may discover that for the first time in history, mankind will be unable to fulfill the basic requirements for survival. That requirement is adjustment to new conditions.

The dinosaur became extinct, not because he could not hold his own with other animals, but because he could not adjust himself to change—in that case, climatic change.

But the threat today, facing man, is not of nature's making but his own. The adjustment he has to make is not an adjustment to natural forces but to forces that he, himself, has created. Unless he can control those forces, he may follow the dinosaur.

Dr. Irving Langmuir, the distinguished scientist, said only last week that an atomic war might make the earth unfit for human habitation because of the radioactivity it might spread over the globe, even if a few buildings were left standing here and there.

His colleague, Dr. Arthur Compton, gave some idea of the direct threat to America when he said that an attack on this country might wipe out every city of more than one hundred thousand population in the first hour of war.

Dr. Robert Oppenheimer, who knows as much about the atomic bomb as anyone anywhere, said that there is no defense against the atomic bomb, that the attack could come from jet planes, or radio-controlled planes, or by planting atomic bombs in strategic places in the United States, and that such an attack would cost

America forty million lives within the first few hours.

That is what an atomic war would mean, and let us not delude ourselves into thinking that no other nation can make the bomb. The atomic scientists warn us that within two to five years every major industrial nation in the world can make its own atomic bombs without any help whatsoever from us. Dr. Oliphant, Britain's leading atomic scientist, believes that the time may be as short as six months.

The world today is moving toward an atomic armament race. The world is moving toward another war. If you don't believe that, just look at your newspapers this morning, then compare the news against a week ago and the news a week ago with the news two weeks ago. Week by week, day by day, the tensions, the international tensions are mounting, and the world is drifting into another and greater catastrophe. It may come upon us very soon unless we act and act fast.

That means we shall have to put an end to the hypocrisy and the double talk that have unfortunately figured so largely in so many of the official pronouncements on atomic energy. (*Applause.*)

We shall have to take off our blinders and look at the world as it really is in the bright light of atomic energy. If there is no security to be found any longer in the armies and navies, however mighty, let us say so.

If strict national sovereignty in an atomic age represents a threat—

a direct threat—to the life of every person everywhere, let us say so.

If power politics or blocs of power or regional alliances can't give us security, let us say so.

If the time has come to abandon the disastrous system of making peace by treaty or by gentlemen's agreement, let us say so.

If we believe that outlawing war in the world means that we shall have to establish law, let us say so.

If law cannot be derived except through government on a world scale, as Captain Stassen has urged, let us say so. If we are missing a golden opportunity to take the moral leadership in the world in moving toward that government, that common sovereignty, that alone can give us a common security, then let us say so. And the time has come to say so. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Norman Cousins. Mr. Cousins has just paved the way very nicely for stating the dilemma of next week's topic which is to be "Does the Atomic Bomb Make World Government Essential Now?" I'll tell you about those speakers a little later.

In the meantime, we are going to hear from the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire. Senator Tobey, I want to ask you a question or two because I remember you told me something about where you are going tomorrow up there in New England, where we were a year ago. What's the name of that town you are from, Senator?

Senator Tobey: The little town of Temple, New Hampshire—224 people that sent 42 boys to the World War. Every boy in town went. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny: It's about half the size of Sergeant Kuroki's hometown.

Senator Tobey: It's so beautiful that I claim it is the site of the original Garden of Eden but without the original sin. I'm not sure on that last point, though.

Moderator Denny: Well, Senator, what is it you are going to do up there tomorrow?

Senator Tobey: I'm going home and have Thanksgiving dinner with my children and grandchildren and my wife in that dear home of mine in Temple, on the farm two and three-quarters miles from town. Come up and visit us sometime.

Moderator Denny: Then you told me about that crossroad store where you are going to get all the news.

Senator Tobey: Yes, I'll go up there to get my mail Saturday night and sit in the emporium of the postoffice and store combined and listen to all the problems of the world settled around that old stove. It's an enjoyable privilege, friends.

Moderator Denny: That's part of what we're fighting for and what we fought this war for. Now we are very happy, indeed, to hear this man from the birthplace of the Town Meetings in America—Senator Charles W. Tobey of New Hampshire. Senator Tobey. (*Applause.*)

Senator Tobey:

The combination here tonight of Town Meeting and Thanksgiving Day connotes New England, where 325 years ago a band of exiles moored their bark on the wild New England shore seeking a haven where they could enjoy religious freedom. Facing great hardships and dangers, they bravely pressed forward and from that nucleus came the Massachusetts Bay Colony and later New England.

They had two outstanding characteristics. One was the continuous recognition of their debt to Almighty God and the other, their alliance on the Divine power. From the Pilgrims came Thanksgiving Day conceived in gratitude for protection and guidance. For their civic affairs, they formed an agency of government which is the essence of true democracy—the New England Town Meeting. There men met and reasoned together in freedom of speech and action as we do tonight.

Generations have come and gone, and our Nation has grown tremendously. From surface indications we are a great success, with unprecedented wealth, a huge population, and a vast territory. We have developed outstanding exploits in business and science. We have fine educational systems, systems of charity and hospitals. We have acquired the art of eating, drinking, and making merry to the nth degree. But in achieving material progress we have lost some of the high character and faith of

our fathers, and these must be recovered if we are to endure.

Perhaps our greatest need today is the revival of common honesty and integrity. We have become so used to cutting corners on the plea that the end justifies the means.

Intolerance still rears its ugly head among us, as Sergeant Kuroki has brought out so well. Intolerance toward the foreign-born in America, for other men's religions, and other men's opinions—nothing could be more un-American.

We find in civic affairs that people are loath to participate and shift their responsibility to others.

Selfishness and greed are concomitants of modern life. As we look abroad we find similar weaknesses in the international scene, with distrust and lack of confidence among nations. Diplomatic efforts are marked by secrecy and language is used to conceal rather than to purvey thoughts, notwithstanding that the people are entitled to the truth—the people who are sovereign.

But suddenly we were faced with a challenging development, for in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, with the explosion of the first atomic bomb over Hiroshima, we were put on notice that the old order changeth and that a power evolved from forces at the very base of the universe challenges mankind to become either a great blessing or a great curse.

So, aghast at the possibilities of this dynamic power, let us reason together. The materials and elements essential to that discovery

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

NORMAN COUSINS—After his graduation in 1933 from Teachers College, Columbia University, Mr. Cousins became an editorial writer for the *New York Post*. After one year at this job he joined the staff of *Current History* where he stayed for five years as literary editor and managing editor. In 1940 he became executive editor of the *Saturday Review of Literature*, and since June, 1942, has been editor. In 1943, Mr. Cousins was appointed publication consultant and editor of "U.S.A." of the Office of War Information. In addition to his magazine writing, Mr. Cousins is the author of *The Good Inheritance*, *The Democratic Chance*, and *Modern Man Is Obsolete*.

CHARLES WILLIAM TOBEY — Senator Tobey, a Republican from New Hampshire, was born in 1880 in Roxbury, Massachusetts. He attended the Roxbury Latin School and has received honorary degrees from Dartmouth College and the University of New Hampshire. Senator Tobey has at various times engaged in the insurance business, farming, banking, and manufacturing. He was a member of the New Hampshire House of Representatives for the terms 1915-16, 1919-20, and 1923-24, serving as speaker during his second term. He was a member and president of the New Hampshire State Senate during 1925-26. During 1929-30 he was governor of New Hampshire and in 1933 was elected to the

73rd U. S. Congress. In 1939, he was elected Senator for the term ending 1945. He is a member of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee.

BEN KUROKI—Sergeant Kuroki, 26-year-old Nisei, was born in Hershey, Nebraska, where his father was a seed-potato grower. He and his brother Fred volunteered for the Army two days after Pearl Harbor and were accepted a month later. Ben entered the Air Forces, but his training days were none too happy. Later in England with a Liberator squadron, he volunteered for gunnery training. Since then he has won two Distinguished Flying Crosses, and many other awards as a qualified turret gunner. He has taken part in 58 missions against the enemy, 30 in Europe and 28 in the Pacific area.

RICHARD C. HOTTELET—A native New Yorker, Mr. Hottelet is a foreign correspondent, radio commentator, and journalist. In 1941, while a United Press correspondent in the Berlin Bureau, he was arrested as "being highly suspected of espionage for an enemy power." Later Mr. Hottelet was head of the London Office of War Information's Central European and Eastern European section. He resigned this position in December, 1943. Recently he has been a war correspondent in Germany for the Columbia Broadcasting System.

of the scientists existed thousands of years ago, but were discovered in efforts to meet the exigencies of the war. So, as we now strive to meet the exigencies of the peace, we have available to us formulas and principles which also have existed for thousands of years and which must be applied to human affairs today, if we are to win the peace.

Let us then turn to the social sciences, the humanities, which if applied can be potent far beyond our dreams, the science of learning to live together and work together, the objective of happiness

and security for all men of good will.

Hear then again the words of Him, who centuries ago, gave us two great Commandments—"Thou shalt love the Lord Thy God with all thy heart," and the second, like unto it, "and thy neighbor as thyself."

Therein is the basic principle for enduring peace.

Why not try it?

And who is our neighbor? His name is legion—those who suffer oppression, those who hunger for food, the needy, yes, and the Jews,

homeless still in prison camps abroad.

Not in legislation lies our best hope for peace, but rather in an understanding of the common denominators in men everywhere, the aspirations and yearnings of people for the right to life, liberty, and happiness. Let us always remember that we are in truth members one with another.

To win the peace, then, there must needs be a spiritual regeneration throughout the world. Mankind must cast off the shackles of intolerance, of national selfishness and greed, of lust for power, and the fears and suspicions which create wars.

To win the peace, then, we must have faith in the capacity of the common man, faith in the power of truth and righteousness and forthright dealings, faith in the One God and Father of us all who has given us a formula whereby men and nations could live together in brotherhood—love thy neighbor as thyself. Therein lies

the hope of a war-weary world. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Senator Charles Tobey of New Hampshire. Now before we take the question from this representative American audience here in Town Hall on this Thanksgiving night, let's pause briefly for station identification.

Announcer:

You are listening to America's Town Meeting, sponsored by *The Reader's Digest*, America's most widely read magazine. Tonight, Senator Charles W. Tobey, Editor Norman Cousins, Foreign Correspondent Richard C. Hottelet, and Sergeant Ben Kuroki, are discussing the vital topic, "We Won the War; Are We Winning the Peace?"

For a complete copy of this discussion, including the question period immediately following, send for the Town Meeting Bulletin. Write to Town Hall, New York 18, New York. Enclose 10 cents to cover the cost of printing and mailing. Mr. Denny.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Now we're ready for the questions from this audience here. We're going to start with the gentleman right here. Will you speak right in the direction of that mike?

Man: Senator Tobey. I would like to know if the peace will be based upon "Love thy neighbor as thyself," shouldn't the same thing be practiced by nations—love

thy neighbor nation as thyself? How can we have love from one to another and have a different theory of justice between one nation and another?

Senator Tobey: I quite agree with the questioner, and I thought I covered it in my talk. I made no distinction. The neighbors are the oppressed, and the needy, and those in trouble all over the world.

We're all brothers under the skin. Religion, if it means anything, is that the love of God for man isn't circumscribed by boundaries, state or national. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The young man up in the balcony, please. Yes?

Man: I'd like to ask Mr. Cousins if he thinks that the discovery of atomic power necessitates a new world charter?

Mr. Cousins: Do you mean by that, sir, that the United Nations Charter, too, is obsolete? Is that the question? Well, like everything else, the United Nations Charter has been affected. It is no reflection upon the men who made the United Nations Charter or upon the peoples of the world who helped build the Charter, that the Charter today is out of date, but that does not mean that we must scrap the United Nations. It means this, that we have the opportunity and the challenge to make the United Nations really spell government, to make the arrangements, the agreements within the United Nations have the force of law, binding law. Then we will have government through the United Nations. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Now we are getting on next week's topic. All right. The gentleman right there.

Man: Does Sergeant Kuroki believe when the hatreds of war have passed that the American people will accept loyal Japanese as good citizens again? Does he not think so?

Sergeant Kuroki: You mean right now?

Man: When the hatreds of war have passed.

Sergeant Kuroki: Yes, after the hatreds of war have passed I believe that all peoples will begin to understand Japanese-Americans, not only here in the United States but in all other countries, too. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. It would be a good idea to publicize some of the loyalties and some of the works of these men during this war, too, to help alleviate the trouble that exists there now. Yes?

Man: This is for Mr. Cousins. "Let us say so." Secretary Byrnes admits that we're shipping American arms to kill independent-fighting Indonesians, that we keep 50,000 Marines in China supplying arms to continue China's civil war. Why does Byrnes hide that he declared World War III against three hundred million people? (*Applause.*)

Mr. Cousins: Is that a question or a statement? I mean, I can't speak for Secretary Byrnes. I'm sorry. I wish I could.

Mr. Denny: I think what he means is, do you approve of Secretary Byrnes' actions?

Mr. Cousins: In that respect, no. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: The young man in the balcony.

Man: This is addressed to Senator Tobey. Senator Tobey, in reference to your remark in your speech about intolerance as one way of losing the peace and we must cure that if we are to win the

peace, what is your stand on a permanent FEPC?

Senator Tobey: Well, I'll tell the gentleman in the gallery, I want to vote for it, and voted once before. Does that answer the question? (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: That seems to answer it pretty definitely. Fair Employment Trade—, what is that, what FEPC is?

Senator Tobey: Fair Employment Practices Commission.

Mr. Denny: Fair Employment Practices Commission. Yes, just in case somebody doesn't know what FEPC is. You get so confused with these initials. Yes? The gentleman right here.

Man: I'd like to ask Mr. Hottelet how we could weld a United States of Europe both politically, socially, and religiously, when we haven't any unity in America, where we're known as North, East, South, and West in every respect?

Mr. Denny: In two minutes, Mr. Hottelet. (*Laughter.*)

Mr. Hottelet: I think that the first requisite for the molding of United States of Europe rests on a much more primary need than obtains in the United States right now. Those people over there don't have enough to eat. They don't have a warm and a dry place to sleep. They have no clothes. They lack the basic necessities of life.

You'd think that if we could propose a program that would start giving them that, they'd junk the historical greeds and economic prejudices that have kept them

apart so long. I think if we proposed a clear program that would bring one part of Europe together in the way economically, for instance, that the United States are a unit, that we'd then be off to a pretty good start. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The lady, please.

Lady: I would like to ask Senator Tobey who are the forces or the powers that keep America from winning the peace? (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: That also in two minutes, Senator.

Senator Tobey: Well, these evils that I have tried to attack in my speech are very subtle forces that are operating day and night to keep us from winning the peace. I can't elaborate more than that. They're with us day and night, constantly— intolerance, lack of vision and understanding of peoples there, selfishness, lust of power, lust for profits, control of world materials, no spirit of brotherhood, get it while the getting is good. Does that answer your question? (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Suppose you make your question a little more specific. Will you speak right in the direction of that microphone.

Lady: Not quite, Senator, because it seems to me that these are only qualities, or states of mind, that you have mentioned, but there must be in back of that human minds that harbor these sentiments or ideas.

Senator Tobey: Well, one of the things, being very definite and specific now, that is militating against peace and winning the

peace, in my judgment and I deplore it, is the tendency of some in this country to keep, if you please, making friction between Russia and this country. (*Applause.*) It's dangerous business. We ought to learn to live together. We have now conflicting trade areas. While Russia is suspicious of us, we're suspicious of her. I do not like, if you please, the tendency today in this country, of forcing Russia to unilateral arrangements with other countries, instead of with the League of Nations or the UNO at San Francisco. Don't discount Russia. Hold out a hand and understand her. Have an understanding heart. Have the spirit of comity rather than alienating Russia. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Mr. Cousins has a question for you, I think, on that point.

Mr. Cousins: On the matter of distrust, do you believe that our atomic bomb policy as it concerns Russia has stirred up any distrust?

Mr. Denny: That for you, Senator Tobey. Has our atomic policy stirred up any distrust?

Senator Tobey: I think very definitely. I think the statement that Molotov made at the London Conference signified that when he said—perhaps, in a semi-jocular way—"All Mr. Byrnes has to do is to wave a little atomic bomb and we all capitulate." Now, think that thing through. What it means is—carried to the last analysis—we're going back. As he said—we have the atomic bomb and more—the race for armaments is on and the third world war is on

the horizon. Let's think a little bit before we act. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: If you don't stop hitting this we're not going to have any radio tubes. (*Laughter.*) He feels this thing pretty vigorously. The young man in the balcony.

Man: I'd like to address this question to Mr. Cousins. Just because each nation is trying to learn the secret of the atomic bomb, that doesn't mean that they want to use it for war purposes. Just as the atomic bomb has been used as a weapon of war, it can also be used as a weapon of peace, to build up a country economically and socially, etc.

Mr. Cousins: I think there is futile debate, going on in the country at this time, as to whether we should or should not share the secret of the atomic bomb. That is not the question. If we can get any security by holding onto the secret, by all means let us do so. On the other hand, let us recognize that every nation in the world can develop its own atomic weapon within a short time.

Now, another thing to consider in that light is that of course other nations may want it for other reasons but the problem is not to control the atomic bomb, the problem is to control war; that if there is a war, even if you can't control atomic weapons, there may be other weapons far worse.

We start with this: Let us control war. Let us, before we talk about secrets or anything else, set up now the international kind of system which can prevent war.

Only then can we keep atomic bombs or other weapons from being used. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. While you're on the question of the constructive use or destructive use of atomic power, there's a man up there in one of the loges that I met yesterday—John Rouse of Rouses Point. Incidentally, he's president of the Chamber of Commerce up there and he's presented an idea to the Chamber of Commerce that Rouses Point should be the first town in the world to ask for a power plant powered with atomic power. Jack, will you ask a question or make a comment at this time, please?

Mr. Rouse: Mr. Denny, thank you very much. I have listened to the speakers tonight speaking about atomic energy. They are saying the same things that have disgusted me, in a sense, by reading them in the papers. They are talking about atomic destruction and I think we ought to be talking about atomic construction. Instead of an atomic war, an atomic peace and a dynamic peace, I believe it is possible, I believe we can have it if we'll just divert ourselves for a little while in our efforts from war to peace.

Mr. Cousins and Mr. Hottelet said that we could exercise leadership. I believe that we can, and I would like to say to Sergeant Kuroki and ask him a question, too, if you please. If we do exercise this leadership which these gentlemen believe is possible, how would we go about qualifying ourselves to exercise this leadership in

the light of what you have experienced?

Mr. Denny: That's about a \$64 question, Sergeant, but we'd like to have your comment on it.

Sergeant Kuroki: I'm pretty nervous right now. I'd like to have him explain a little better.

Mr. Denny: Well, he just means, I think, that if we're as bad as we probably are—as you painted us—so far as intolerance and prejudice in this country goes, are we qualified morally and spiritually—is that what you mean, Jack?

Mr. Rouse: If he's going on another mission, I'd like to go with him. A lot of other people would too. How can we go with you, Sergeant? (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: That's it. That's a better way to ask it.

Sergeant Kuroki: I think there are various ways. We need a better understanding among all people first, and we have to work on the basis of equality regardless of what nationality you are. Some of those things, I believe, have been discussed before. One of the main things is the minorities that are being discriminated against in jobs. The Fair Employment Practices Commission would be the ideal thing for that.

Second, I believe homes are an essential thing. If people could get decent homes and get on the same equality. I know that a lot of people discriminate against the minorities because they say they don't live in clean communities and their way of living is very low. Well, that's because there are signs that say "Japs keep out," or say

"We don't want any colored people in this district." (*Applause.*)

Third, I think you could also have a little education all the way round for people who don't understand, and also for children. I think it's very essential there that the children be educated in the proper manners. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, very much, Sergeant. Those are all good practical suggestions. Mr. Cousins said he wanted to comment on what Mr. Rouse has said. Mr. Cousins.

Mr. Cousins: I agree with you, sir, that it's important, too, when talking about atomic energy to stress occasionally the constructive aspects of it, because there are constructive aspects. We can build for the first time a universal peace. For the first time, we have the power, in atomic energy, to provide for man's needs on a world scale, but before we do that we shall first have to make sure that we have a planet to do it on and that means peace first. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The man in the balcony.

Man: I'm addressing my question to Mr. Hottelet. Do you think that following the directives of the Potsdam Conference will make for peace in Europe or the world?

Mr. Hottelet: The Potsdam Conference resulted in a compromise. There were no clear issues really brought out. There was a long session, I remember. I was there, myself. There was a dragging out from day to day because they couldn't really get together on the basic issues. The basic issues, so

far as Europe goes—and Europe is just a trial for a unification of the world—the basic issue, as far as Europe goes, is to get what is a tiny continent, something which is only a corner of the United States, which is now split up into various smaller units—each of them suspicious of the other, each with different economic, with different political backgrounds and tastes and prejudices—and mold them together to realize that they are only one, that the man who grows food in one corner has to provide it for the man in the other, that the coal fields in one part of Europe have to go to feed factories elsewhere. That was not done at the Potsdam Conference. They just contented themselves with generalizations that everything should be good, and I'm sure that nobody will dispute that. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: It looks like we'll still have to keep our eyes on these big shots.

Man: Senator Tobey spoke so thrillingly about the Golden Rule. I should like to ask him what can be done to cause our State Department and Congress to translate the Golden Rule into international action. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Well, you couldn't very well do that in two minutes, could you? What could be done to—

Man: What can we do to cause our State Department and Congress to translate the Golden Rule into action?

Mr. Denny: That's better. What can we do, Senator? You've got the answer to that—to help them

translate that into action. How about starting with ourselves?

Senator Tobey: Well, I was going to say the first line of opposition there is our own will, our own self there. Let's get right, ourselves, first. Then let the American home and the American church get on the job and produce the harvest it ought to produce. We've slipped some there. Then let the electorate bear in mind the type of men elected to public office and know their standards and principles and what their goals are and elect those men to office. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you.

Man: My question is for Mr. Cousins. Mr. Cousins, it tooks the best scientific minds two years to discover the atomic bomb. Why should we get panicky now if it takes us a little time to figure out the way for world peace?

Mr. Cousins: I agree with you that there is no consolation, nothing constructive to gain from panic action. We must be as calm and as deliberate about this as is humanly possible. But, I think this, that there comes a time in the life of everyone where you may be faced with a desperate situation and where desperate measures may be necessary. A man who is very ill and may need, let us say, 1,000,000 units of penicillin, must have those 1,000,000 units of penicillin at one time at that one day. Now, you can't tell that man to take 100,000 units of penicillin over a period of ten days, because by the end of ten days, it may be too late. I think the world today needs

1,000,000 units of penicillin and it needs it very fast and nothing can be gained by being blind to the facts. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The young lady.

Lady: Senator Tobey. Why don't the American people, through Congress, appropriate say one billion dollars for educating the American people and for exchange education by people all over the world toward this world understanding? Also, why don't we tighten our own belts, go on with rationing, and help feed the rest of the world? (*Applause.*)

Senator Tobey: I'm with you. Both suggestions are good. I'm looking forward to making a speech demanding, on the Senate floor, that we make good our appropriation for UNNRA and giving all that's necessary to take care of those stricken people over there. (*Applause.*) And about the exchange students and one billion dollars—we could do far worse than to do that. It's part of the agenda in the hearts and some of the minds, too, in Washington. I thank you for the suggestion. I'll carry it back to kindred minds there. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you.

Lady: My question is directed to Sergeant Kuroki. You brought out a very good point by referring to the gentleman from Mississippi, Senator Bilbo. To win the peace quickly, he should be impeached for spreading race hatred and intolerance (*applause drowning out several words*) . . . given a chance

to prove their loyalty as they have done so during this World War II.

Mr. Denny: I'm sorry. That is a pretty severe attack on another person in the light of a question. I must ask you to make your point to the question. Regardless of what your opinion may be, it isn't fair to attack a person anonymously from the audience.

Lady: According to the Ives-Quinn Bill, a man like him should be impeached because he is spreading—

Mr. Denny: Never mind. He doesn't live in New York State for one thing and the Ives-Quinn Bill applies to New York State. He's a United States Senator, and he's entitled to his opinions whether they are favorable to you or not. I'm sorry; that isn't quite fair. Just talk about the question at issue if you want to. Now, the young man up there has a question for Sergeant Kuroki.

Man: I'd like to address my question to Sergeant Kuroki. I'd like to ask him how can the communities of this nation work, as his town of Hershey has, to have a citizenry which will respect all peoples of all minorities?

Mr. Denny: He's answered that question partly. Do you have any more to say about that, Sergeant?

Sergeant Kuroki: Well, I think that if we had a little more social meetings and such, because I know in New York and a lot of these Eastern cities they've never become familiar with Japanese-Americans. Like myself—I've come out from my community with my Caucasian friends and we have had a very

good understanding. I think that's one of the things that you don't have here in New York, possibly. Does that answer your question? (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Have more social meetings. That's a very good concrete answer to the question. Yes? The young man down here?

Man: Mr. Cousins. If Hitler was elected to the United States Senate, would he be entitled to his opinions. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: That's what President Roosevelt used to call an "iffy" question. It doesn't count. Let's have another one. (*Laughter.*) Take the young man here who has a question for Mr. Cousins.

Man: My question is addressed to Senator—no, to Mr. Cousins. (*Laughter.*)

Mr. Cousins: I thank you for the promotion, sir.

Man: Can we be assured of the world peace, when there are still sparks of unrest, meaning the situations in Palestine and Java, which may in the future bring world powers to sides, which may bring on another world war?

Mr. Cousins: What you were saying is this, as I understand it, how can you have peace when you have these tensions? I agree with you. What we need today in the world, as I tried to stress before, was the existence of law. We've never had international law before, because we've tried to have international law in a vacuum.

The only way you can get law is through government. Now the magic word of the hour is control.

We want to control war, we want to control the atomic bomb. You cannot have control unless you have power. You cannot have power unless you have law. You don't want that type of power. It would be brute, irresponsible force. If you have power through law, you must have law through government.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Now, Mr. Cousins, we've all been very critical here of the fact that we've won the war but are not winning the peace. In these last few minutes that are left for us, almost a few seconds, I wonder if each of you would contribute a little something on the constructive line to suggest what we can do to win the peace. Sergeant Kuroki.

Sergeant Kuroki: Well, if we would really win the peace, I guess I would feel pretty much at ease in entering public places. It would probably be the same with a lot of racial minorities that are being discriminated against. But I think the greatest feeling would be for me and a lot of my other buddy soldiers to know that our buddies who fought with us overseas had not really died in vain. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Hottelet. What do you say?

Mr. Hottelet: Well, I think the world is a small place now. It's about the size of a shriveled orange. Technological means have brought it together. What we need now is a single moral purpose. We've all got to want to work together and, in order to get to that point, we've got to know

more about one another and about the ideals that motivate each of us. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Senator Tobey, please. The question is what should the world be like, what should this country be like, and what should the people here be like if we're going to win the peace?

Senator Tobey: Well, the products of winning the peace, and I connote that to mean a permanent peace, would be an era of prosperity and utopia such as the world has never seen before. If the mothers of the country, who bear children and go down in the valley of the shadow of death to bring a child in the world, could have the assurance in their hearts that peace is permanent, what a relief it would be, what a sacrifice would not be entailed in the future of those mothers. Think what it would mean to institutions of learning and of feelings to have a way of life—more leisure for people, less tax rates and all. Why, it's a goal worth striving for. Why not have it? It's within our power. As a people of the world, God help us to work to that end. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Senator Tobey. Mr. Hottelet, Sergeant Kuroki, and Norman Cousins for a most appropriate Thanksgiving Day program. Now before I tell you about next week's program, we bring a significant message written by my good friend, John Ward Studebaker, United States Commissioner of Education. He said:

Announcer: "When I learned in 1940 that bricklaying was a favorite diversion of Winston Churchill, I knew that Hitler was foredoomed for the bricklayer works by a plumb line, straight and true, not by intuition. The plumb line of democracy, by which its walls are built straight and true, is the American social faith in the intrinsic and potential worth of every human person. From this faith grows our determination that every American child shall have an opportunity to develop his full intellectual and ethical capacity whether he is dull or bright, white or black, Catholic, Jew, Protestant, or unbeliever, and whether he comes from a farmhouse or a penthouse.

From this belief, in the real worth of every individual, comes also the need of freedom of inquiry, freedom to learn the truth even if it runs counter to contemporary creeds. And since we feel the state is the individual's servant, the humblest citizen has not only the right but the obligation to criticize his government, to seek to improve it so that it will more freely represent and serve the common will. To this purpose, the opportunity to learn is not only a fundamental human right, but a necessity. But textbook instruction however important is not enough. Equally important to mental and spiritual

growth is the living record provided by newspapers and magazines of the happenings, conditions, and trends that the students must deal with on leaving school.

"Because no one can be truly educated, by which I mean sharply aware of the world we live in, unless he is intelligently informed on current news, facts, and tendencies, I hope that parents and teachers will encourage their young people to read good magazines regularly both at home and in the schools."

Now *The Reader's Digest* returns you to Mr. Denny.

Mr. Denny: Next week we take up the challenge suggested by Norman Cousins here tonight with the topic, "Does the Atomic Bomb Make World Government Essential Now?" Our speakers will be Raymond Swing, distinguished radio commentator heard regularly on this network at 7:15 p.m., Eastern Standard Time; and Lieutenant Cord Meyer, brilliant young former naval aide to Captain Harold Stassen; former Lieutenant Colonel Tex McCrary, of the PRO of the 8th Air Force, and former editor of the *Daily Mirror*; and George Fielding Eliot, military analyst, columnist, and author.

What do you think? Be sure to tune in when *The Reader's Digest* brings you TOWN MEETING. (Applause.)

TOWN MEETING PREVIEW

Do We Need Universal Military Training Now?

By CHARLES E. MARTZ

The subject outlined in this preview is to our best knowledge the one which will be used on Town Meeting of the Air Thursday evening, December 6. However, in view of the rapidity of wartime developments there is always a possibility that another topic which seems more urgent may be substituted.

As this Preview is written, hearings are still in progress before a Senate Committee on the bill providing for universal military training of our boys. According to the terms of the bill, every boy who is not absolutely disqualified by physical condition will spend a year in training when he finishes high school or reaches his eighteenth birthday.

A few searching questions must be answered by all Americans seeking to arrive at a valid conclusion on this subject.

1. *Is universal training needed for the national defense?* We have gone into every war in our history unprepared. This fact has undoubtedly led to mounting costs, both in life and property. Those who favor universal training insist that much time will be saved, should war come to us again, if we have a nucleus of trained men for our armed forces. With universal training, we should at all times have at least a million men either completing their training or recently graduated from training camps. The armed forces could be ready for action in short order.

The other side points to the word "now" in our topic. They say that we now have 12 million men who have not only basic

training but wartime experience. There is no time in our history when we were better prepared for an emergency. There is, then, no reason why we should rush into universal training before we have had time to study it more fully, particularly in its effects upon the rest of the world.

The antagonists also point with some suspicion to the efficacy of the reserve created by universal training. The art of war moves rapidly. Men trained two years ago may be utterly useless today, unless trained anew. The physical results of training are easily dissipated in a few years. Even the habits of discipline are likely to be weakened.

2. *What will be the effect of universal training on world peace?* It is understood by every American that the adoption of universal training would not mean that we were likely to become an aggressor nation. What, then, is its purpose?

Those who favor the system point out that the influence of a nation will be directly proportional to its power—that foreign nations respect only might. Our place as a nation that is intent upon preserving the peace of the world will be based upon our ability to

back whatever demands we feel that it is necessary to make. We should speak softly — but we should still carry a big stick for use if necessary. Only in that way can we have the greatest influence in favor of world peace.

The opposition holds that world peace can only be preserved through the development of mutual trust and confidence among the nations—and particularly between the United States and Russia. History seems clear in its lesson that preparation for war breeds suspicion and counter-preparation. Now is the time to allay suspicions, even though they seem to us to be silly. Compulsory military service and a large army reserve did not save France and Russia from attack. Only a movement toward disarmament can bring about the conditions that we so earnestly want.

3. *Where does the atomic bomb fit into this problem?* The atomic bomb has changed the face of war. Yet, say those favoring universal training, there will always be need for a large force to meet an attack, or to occupy an enemy's country. The opposition doubts that a nation attacked in the future will have much opportunity to use its large army or navy. It places its hope for survival on the prevention of war rather than on victory.

4. *Will the effect on those being trained be good?* Here we shall find wide differences of opinion. On one side there is emphasis upon the physical benefits. Remediable troubles may be

spotted and cured. A year's regular routine with nourishing food will be good for every boy. On the other side is the opinion that the age of 18 is too late to do more than superficial remedial work.

Other aspects of training life are also moot points. Will the discipline of the year lead to salutary results in future conduct, or will it produce a man who looks for direction in every situation and who is unfitted for life in a democracy? Will the year away from normal social contacts result beneficially, or will it result in releases in undesirable conduct?

Underlying all these points of view is the question about the democratic character of the program. On one hand we hear that universal training is the epitome of democracy, because all boys are treated alike, all give their service in the same way, and the contacts formed will give boys of widely separated classes and geographic regions a mutual respect. On the other side we hear that uniformity is not necessarily democracy, and that universal training in a period when there is no emergency is a definite step toward the totalitarian mode of life.

We are here discussing a question with which we have had no experience. Universal training is something new for the United States. There is some question as to whether anyone can give categorical answers to any of the above questions. The best that we can do is to use what background we have for a look into the future.